



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,595	06/14/2001	Sean W. March	NORT0097US (14454RRUS01U)	6420
7590	12/15/2004		EXAMINER	MACE, BRAD THOMAS
Dan C. Hu TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. Ste. 100 8554 Katy Freeway Houston, TX 77024			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2663	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/881,595	MARCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brad T. Mace	2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 1-4, 10-19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by PCT No. WO 01/37510 (Cohen), as submitted by applicant.

Regarding claim 1:

Cohen discloses a system capable of communicating with plural devices on one or more networks, comprising:

a storage module to store address translation information (Figure 4a, "translation table); and

a controller adapted to receive a data unit from a first network (pg. 18, lines 10-12, and Figure 4b, deception network and control 25), the data unit having a source address and a destination address (pg. 18, lines 23-26),

the controller adapted to further translate both the source address and the destination address of the data unit based on the address translation information (pg. 18, lines 23-27, where the source and destination addresses were translated based on the proxy addressing).

Regarding claim 2:

Cohen discloses wherein the network address translation information contains a first address associated with a first device (pg. 18, lines 6-9, e.g. IP address w.x.y.z) and a second address associated with a second device (pg. 18, lines 6-9, e.g. IP address m.n.o.p), the address translation information to map the first address to a first alias address and to map the second address to a second alias address (Figure 4A, where a translation table is used to associate each internal address to an external address/port number).

Regarding claim 3:

Cohen discloses wherein the controller is adapted to further transmit the data unit containing the translated source address and destination address to the first network or another network (Figure 4b, and pg. 19, lines 19-23, where the translated datagram is handled by the Real System in the inner network).

Regarding claim 4:

Cohen discloses wherein the address translation information comprises an address and port translation table, and wherein the controller is adapted to further translate a source port and a destination port in the data unit (Figure 4a, the translation table is used to associate each internal address to an external address/port number and pg. 18, lines 23-26, where the source and destination addresses were translated and hence can also correspond to the source and destination port).

Regarding claim 10:

Cohen discloses a method of communicating between two endpoints, comprising:

in a communications portal, providing a first interface to a first device and providing a second interface to a second device (Figure 4b, where a first interface exists at deception system 20(a-d) for a first device (indicated by w.x.y.z) and a second interface exists at deception system 22(a-d) for a second device (real machine in inner network));

transporting data units, through the communications portal, between the first device and the second device (Figure 4b, where data flows from the Internet (from a corresponding device) through the deception systems to the second device (real machine in inner network)).

the communications portal hiding an address of the first device from the second device and hiding an address of the second device from the first device (pg. 19, lines 19-27, where the deception system translates (hides) the first device address from the real machine in the inner network, and where responses are sent back by proxy translation system translating the address back so that the outsider (first device) observes the same behavior that would be encountered if the original system were handling the request, hence the address of the real machine is hidden from the first device).

Regarding claim 11:

Cohen discloses storing address translation information (Figure 4a, where the translation table stores translation information); and translating both a source address and a destination address of each data unit (pg. 18, lines 23-27, where the source and destination addresses were translated based on the proxy addressing).

Regarding claim 12:

Cohen discloses storing port information translation information (Figure 4a, where the translation table stores port information); and translating both a source port and a destination port of each data unit (Figure 4a, the translation table is used to associate each internal address to an external address/port number and pg. 18, lines 23-26, where the source and destination addresses were translated and hence can also correspond to the source and destination port).

Regarding claim 13:

Cohen discloses wherein translating the source and destination addresses and ports comprises translating Internet Protocol addresses and User Datagram Protocol ports (Figure 4A, and pg. 18, lines 10-22, where translation occurs on IP addresses corresponding to datagrams (hence corresponding to user datagram protocol ports)).

Regarding claim 14:

Cohen discloses wherein storing the address translation information comprises storing a first device address associated with the first device and a second device address associated with the second device, and storing a first alias address mapped to the first device address and a second alias address mapped to the second device address (Figure 4a, where the translation table maintains the association between the internal address to an external address).

Regarding claim 15:

Cohen discloses wherein providing the first interface comprises providing the second alias address to represent the second device to the first device, and providing

the second interface comprises providing the first alias address to represent the first device to the second device (Figure 4b, where the real machine receives the translated address and where responses are sent back by proxy translation system translating the address back so that the outsider (first device) observes the same behavior that would be encountered if the original system were handling the request, hence the actual address of the real machine is not known by the first device).

Regarding claim 16:

Cohen discloses an article comprising at least one storage medium containing instructions that when executed cause a system to:

store address translation information (Figure 4a, where the translation table stores translation information);

receive a data unit containing a source address and a destination address (pg. 18, lines 23-26); and

translate both the source and destination addresses based on the address translation table (pg. 18, lines 23-27, where the source and destination addresses were translated based on the proxy addressing).

Regarding claim 17:

Cohen discloses wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to further store the address translation information as an entry in an address translation table having plural entries (Figure 4a, where the translation table maintains each association of internal addresses to external addresses).

Regarding claim 18:

Cohen discloses wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to use different entries of the address translation table for different communication sessions (Figure 4a, where a two step system can translate for 64,000 addresses using 17 computers, hence different entries of the translations table can be utilized for different communication sessions).

Regarding claim 19:

Cohen discloses wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to transmit the data unit with the translated source and destination addresses (Figure 4b, and pg. 19, lines 19-23, where the translated datagram is handled by the Real System in the inner network).

Regarding claim 21:

Cohen discloses wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to further store port translation information, and to translate both the source and destination port of the data unit based on the port translation information (Figure 4a, the translation table is used to associate each internal address to an external address/port number and pg. 18, lines 23-26, where the source and destination addresses were translated and hence can also correspond to the source and destination port).

Regarding claim 22:

Cohen discloses wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to receive the data unit comprising an Internet Protocol packet (Figure 4A, and pg. 18, lines 10-22, where translation occurs on IP addresses corresponding to datagrams (packets)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-9, 20, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PCT No. WO 01/37510 (Cohen) in view of Marshall et al. (SIP extensions for caller identity and privacy). (Both submitted by applicant).

Regarding claims 5-9:

Cohen discloses substantially all the claimed invention as specified above, however, does not disclose expressly wherein the data unit comprises an Internet Protocol header and a User Datagram Protocol header, wherein the data unit contains Real-Time Protocol data, wherein the controller comprises a media portal adapted to communicate data units containing media data between plural devices, the system further comprising an agent adapted to perform call control signaling to establish a call session in which the data units are communicated, wherein the agent is adapted to communicate requests to the controller to dynamically create and update the address translation information in a call session, and wherein the data unit comprises a data unit to be communicated between at least two devices in a all session.

Marshall et al. discloses wherein the data unit comprises an Internet Protocol header and a User Datagram Protocol header (pg. 17-18, section 7.2, where a SIP message in a call setup can utilize an IP and UDP header), wherein the data unit

contains Real-Time Protocol data (see section 7.2, Figure 3), wherein the controller comprises a media portal adapted to communicate data units containing media data between plural devices, the system further comprising an agent adapted to perform call control signaling to establish a call session in which the data units are communicated (section 7.2, lines 1-5, where the anonymizer performs both functions), wherein the agent is adapted to communicate requests to the controller to dynamically create and update the address translation information in a call session (pg. 18, lines 1-14, where the anonymizer adds a level of indirection by hiding the IP addresses, hence creates and updates the address translation (using proxies, Figure 3) in a call session setup), and wherein the data unit comprises a data unit to be communicated between at least two devices in a all session (section 7.2, Figure 3, UA-o (user agent) and UA-t, and pg. 18, lines 1-5).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Marshall et al. in Cohen in order to perform call control signaling to establish a call session in which the data units (using known headers and protocols) are communicated and where address translation information is created and updated when a call session is setup. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Marshall et al. in Cohen (collectively Cohen-Marshall et al.) in order to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5-9. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to have a device to establish a call session where full (IP-address) privacy is established using existing protocols (and corresponding headers).

Regarding claims 20, 23, 24:

Cohen discloses substantially all the claimed invention as specified above, however, does not disclose expressly wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to communicate the data unit that is part of a call session between two endpoints, wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to further: allocate an address for a call session, the address being part of the address translation information; and deallocate the address in response to termination of the call session, and wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to further use the deallocated address for another call session as needed.

Marshall et al. discloses wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to communicate the data unit that is part of a call session between two endpoints (section 7.2, Figure 3, UA-o (user agent) and UA-t), wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to further: allocate an address for a call session, the address being part of the address translation information (pg. 18, lines 1-3, where anonymizer adds a level of indirection hiding the IP addresses and Figure 3, Proxy-o and Proxy-t); and deallocate the address in response to termination of the call session (Figure 3, when the call session is finished, hence the proxy addressing is freed), and wherein the instructions when executed cause the system to further use the deallocated address for another call session as needed (Figure 3, when the call session is finished, hence the proxy addressing is freed, hence can be used for the next call session).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Marshall et al. in Cohen in order to establish a call session between two endpoints, in

which the data units are communicated using address space that is allocated and deallocated according the status of the call session. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Marshall et al. in Cohen (collectively Cohen-Marshall et al.) in order to obtain the invention as specified in claims 20, 23, and 24. The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to have a device to establish a call session where full (IP-address) privacy is established through proxy addressing.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brad T. Mace whose telephone number is (571) 272-3128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

b7m

Brad T. Mace

Chau T. Nguyen
CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600